

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trudemark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

09/646,988 11/16/2000 Tomo Ueno SUGI:093 3887  7590 09/03/2002  Parkhurst & Wendel Suite 210 1421 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314-2805	09/646,988 11/16/2000 Tomo Ueno SUGI:093 3887  7590 09/03/2002  Parkhurst & Wendel Suite 210 1421 Prince Street CHEN, BRET P	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
Parkhurst & Wendel Suite 210 1421 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314-2805	Parkhurst & Wendel Suite 210 1421 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314-2805	09/646,988	11/16/2000	Tomo Ueno	SUGI:093	
Suite 210 1421 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314-2805	Suite 210 1421 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314-2805	75	90 09/03/2002	•		
1421 Prince Street CHEN, BRET P Alexandria, VA 22314-2805	1421 Prince Street CHEN, BRET P Alexandria, VA 22314-2805				EXAMINER	
		1421 Prince Street			CHEN, BRET P	
	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	Alexandria, VA	22314-2805			
1762					DATE MAILED: 09/03/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Application No. 09/646,988

**Bret Chen** 

Applicant(s)

Tomo Ueno

Advisory Action

Art Unit

1762



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED Aug 22, 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)] a) X The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ \_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). A Notice of Appeal was filed on . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 2.  $\square$  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: (a) \( \subseteq \) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c)  $\Box$  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d)  $\square$  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 4. 🗆 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). The a)  $\square$  affidavit, b)  $\square$  exhibit, or c)  $\boxtimes$  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the 5. 🗶 application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons listed on the following pages. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)  $\square$  will not be entered or b)  $\square$  will be entered and an 7. 🗆 explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_ Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_\_ is a)  $\square$  approved or b)  $\square$  disapproved by the Examiner. 8. 🗆 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10. Other:

**BRET CHEN** PRIMARY EXAMINER **ART UNIT 1762** 

Art Unit: 1762

The Request for Reconsideration dated 8/22/02 has been considered but is not deemed persuasive.

Applicant argues that the term "metastable" is disclosed on pp.5-6 of the specification (paragraph bridging pp.1-2).

The examiner disagrees. The examiner is unable to find anywhere on said pages the use of said term. Hence, the term is still deemed new matter.

Applicant next argues that Matsui fails to teach krypton and xenon having an exited metastable state (p.3 lines 5-9).

The examiner disagrees. It is noted that Matsui discloses a plasma-excited rare gas (col.4 lines 27-31) and that the gas mixture can be in the metastable state (lines 58-65). It is the examiner's position that the claimed limitation reads on the cited reference.

Applicant next argues that Ueno fails to teach krypton and xenon having an exited metastable state (p.4 lines 8-16).

The examiner disagrees. It is noted that Ueno fairly teaches a rare gas in a metastable state (col.2 lines 7-12 and 37-44). The examiner contends that Ueno meets the applicant's claim.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive.

Art Unit: 1762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bret Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-3809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck, can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310. Amendment After Finals should be faxed to (703) 872-9311.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

bc August 30, 2002

> BRET CHEN PRIMARY EXAMINER